

### Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2004. Claims 1-59 are currently pending. Claims 5, 9, 11, 15-18, 20-25, 27-38, 43, 45, 47-49, 57 and 59 are amended. Claims 44 and 46 have been cancelled.

Claims 19, 52-56 and 58 are allowed. Claims 11-18, 20-21, 38-39, 43, 47-51, 57 and 59 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. Claims 1-10, 22-24, 26-37 and 40-42 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection(s) set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 1-18, 20-25, 27, 28, 31-43, 45, 46 and 59 are objected to because of containing informalities.

Claim 45 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 11-18, 20-21, 38-39, 43, 47-51, 57 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Cao et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,725,408 B1).

#### I. Specification

As suggested by the Examiner, a brief description of Fig. 13 has been added. Support for the amendment to the "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS" is found on page 24, line 5 of the Specification. No new matter is added.

#### II. Objection to Claims 1-18, 20-25, 27, 28, 31-43, 45 and 59

Claims 1-18, 20-25, 27, 28, 31-43, 45 and 59 are objected to because of containing informalities.

In regard to claim 1, line 1, the Examiner suggests changing "circuitry" to "a circuitry". However, "circuitry" does not appear in claim 1 and clarification is respectfully requested.

In regard to the remaining objected claims, applicants' attorney has amended the claims to correct informalities, along with other claims, as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 1-18, 20-25, 27, 28, 31-43, 45 and 59.

III. Objection to Claim 45

Claim 45 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As suggested by the Examiner, claim 45 has been rewritten and is believed allowable.

IV. Rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 25 as amended states "the select circuit is responsive to the select signal..."

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

V. Rejection of Claims 11-18, 20-21, 38-39, 43, 47-51, 57 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 11-18, 20-21, 38-39, 43, 47-51, 57 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants' attorney has amended the rejected claims, along with other claims, to correct informalities and provide proper antecedent basis. However, the Examiner rejected claim 11 because "the selected control signal" lacks antecedent basis. Yet, "a selected control signal" is provided at line 7 of claim 11 and therefore was not amended.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 11-18, 20-21, 38-39, 43, 47-51, 57 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

VI. Rejection of Claims 44 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Cao et al.*

Applicants' attorney disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of claims 44 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), but has cancelled claims 44 and 46 in order to expedite prosecution.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 44 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is considered moot.

VII. Comments on Statement Of Reasons For Allowance

In the Office Action, the Examiner provided Reasons for Allowance (hereinafter referred to as the "REASONS"). Applicants believe that the REASONS, to the extent understood, may be misconstrued and, as such, are incomplete. Applicants submit that indeed, the claims of the instant application, individually or in combination with other claims (via dependency), describe the patentable subject matter of Applicants' invention(s). Accordingly, the REASONS in no way bind or affect the interpretation, infringement, validity and/or enforceability of any claim(s) or patent(s) resulting from, or relating to this application.

VIII. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-43, 45 and 47-59 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 25, 2005

By: 

Kirk J. DeNiro  
Reg. No. 35,854

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP  
685 Market Street, Suite 540  
San Francisco, California 94105-4206  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665